

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

ITEMS

VOLUME 11 · NUMBER 2 · JUNE 1957
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND UNESCO: REPORT ON THE NINTH GENERAL CONFERENCE IN NEW DELHI, 1956

by Donald G. Marquis *

THE Ninth Session of the General Conference of UNESCO met in New Delhi, India, November 5–December 5, 1956. This meeting, coming at the end of the first decade of United Nations history, was remarkable in several respects. It was the first major United Nations gathering to be held in Asia; and the Indian Government had constructed for the occasion a spacious modern conference hall, a six-story office building, and two hotels, and had arranged an elaborate schedule of cultural and social events. The meeting was distinguished by the difficulties of conducting calm discussions of education, science, and culture during a period of world crisis involving the military intervention in Egypt and the revolt in Hungary. It was of especial interest to the Council, finally, for the extent to which it had assisted in the formulation of the U. S. delegation's position concerning the social science program of UNESCO.

The General Conference, now held every two years, is the governing body of UNESCO. It determines membership, legislates on basic organizational and administrative matters, formulates general policy guidance for the program, and decides on budget allocations. The New Delhi Conference was made up of 359 official delegates and alternates from 77 of UNESCO's 80 member states, 157 advisers, and 32 representatives of nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations. The U. S. delegation

was one of the largest, consisting of 5 delegates, 2 alternates, and 15 advisers named by the President on nomination by the Department of State. Stanley Allyn, president of the National Cash Register Company, was chairman of the delegation.

COUNCIL COOPERATION

The participation of the Council in the preparation for the UNESCO Conference was not inconsiderable. At the request of the UNESCO Relations Staff of the Department of State, four meetings were held in 1955 and 1956, to which were invited representatives of the National Commission, the Department of State, the Council, and other social scientists. Malcolm M. Willey, its representative on the National Commission, served as chairman, and Bryce Wood acted as staff for the groups.

In the course of these meetings the social scientists became more informed about the organization and program of UNESCO and were able to clarify and formulate some suggestions as to the most appropriate and effective role of the social sciences. These analyses and recommendations were reviewed by the U. S. National Commission and contributed to the materials prepared for the guidance of the U. S. delegation to the UNESCO Conference. While it is obviously impossible to summarize briefly the views worked out in these meetings, a few of the general points deserve mention:

1. In view of the limitations of its resources and organization, UNESCO can probably be most effective not by conducting research or even by planning research to be carried out by others, but rather by promoting inter-

* The author is Chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Michigan, and a member of the board of directors of the Council. He has served on the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO since 1955 as a representative of the American Psychological Association, and is a member of the Program Committee and of the Executive Committee of the Commission. He was a member of the U. S. delegation to the Ninth General Conference of UNESCO, serving as adviser on social science, and presented this report to the Council informally in March.

national discussion and dissemination of the results of research which is completed or in process.

2. The members of UNESCO, many of which are quite unfamiliar with the nature of the social sciences as they have developed in western countries, should not be encouraged to believe that the social sciences can provide "solutions" to major social problems such as international tensions; or that the social sciences may be "a means of promoting human rights," as set forth in a recent UNESCO publication; or that the Director-General, through the Department of Social Sciences, can "take the necessary measures to eliminate race prejudice," as stated in the proposed program (with a budget of \$28,100!).

3. Accepting the goal of supporting international cooperation among social scientists, UNESCO should give major effort to the development, in as many countries as possible, of social scientists who can join in cooperative activities. Such development would be furthered by strengthening existing programs for exchange of students and teachers and for support of member states in their plans for improving training and research in social science.

4. The most promising subject for UNESCO effort was believed to be the social implications of technological change. This topic is of major concern to the many member states that are undertaking development programs and is also of substantial interest to research scientists in the United States and western Europe.

THE GENERAL PROGRAM OF UNESCO

Several months before the meeting of the General Conference, the Director-General of UNESCO assembled program plans from the secretariat and prepared for distribution a Proposed Program and Budget for 1957-58. This document is organized in terms of the five departments of UNESCO: Education, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Cultural Activities, and Mass Communication, and the more general activities involved in Exchange of Persons and General Administration.

The proposed budget for the two-year period was 21.6 million dollars, an increase of more than a million dollars over the previous biennium. The funds are derived from contributions by the member states in proportion to their total national income. The contribution of the United States is approximately one third of the total expenditure. It is customary for the Conference to decide on a total budget figure early in the session. A proposal to increase the budget by one million dollars was presented by Brazil and enthusiastically voted by a large majority, over the protests of the countries making the major contributions. Since no program plans for this

extra money had been developed in advance of the Conference, the vote opened floodgates for numerous proposals by interested parties in support of favorite projects. However, most of the additional money was finally allocated to major projects for which work plans had been previously formulated to some degree.

When seen in the perspective of time, it is probable that the most important achievement of the Ninth General Conference will be the initiation of "major projects," representing a concentration and focus of effort in contrast to the hundreds of little projects which have characterized UNESCO activity in the past. The concept of major projects was authorized by the preceding Conference in Montevideo, but the statement was abstract and not precise. During the succeeding two years support for the idea of concentrated effort has been increasing, and at New Delhi approval was given to plans for three major projects with highest priority and substantial funds.

The first such project contributes to the extension of primary education in Latin America, largely through the training of teachers. The project was approved for a ten-year period with a budget of over \$600,000 for the first two years, "to the end that within the ten-year period the cooperating states may be near the goal of providing primary school education for all children." The second major project, unlike the first, is a gradual enlargement of work already under way on the problems of arid zones. The third project is directed to the development of greater mutual understanding of Asian and Western cultural values. While the interest in this project was intense and widespread, there was no common understanding of what it involved or how it might be carried out. The Conference authorized the establishment of an advisory committee to develop a program plan and assist in its execution.

A small item for social science participation in each of the major projects was inserted, but no work plans have yet been announced.

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

The program of the Department of Social Sciences, while not as large as those of the other departments, is substantial and fairly well established. It seems to have solid support in the UNESCO organization and from the member states. During the several days that the Conference devoted to social science, there was no criticism or disapproval of the over-all plans. Instead there were expressions from delegates of several member states to the effect that the total effort in social science should be increased.

There seemed to be general interest within interna-

tional organizations in certain fields of social science activity for UNESCO. The senior representative of the Secretary General of the United Nations stated that under priorities laid down by its Economic and Social Council, the United Nations took keen interest in four fields of UNESCO activity: the first two major projects, study of the social aspects of technological change, and development of the teaching of the social sciences. The report of the Executive Board of UNESCO contained the recommendation "that the Director-General give increasing attention to the role of social sciences for countries engaged in plans for economic and social development." The Board also welcomed "the inclusion of the social sciences as one of the fields in which the Organization will offer technical assistance in 1957-58."

The UNESCO Committee for the Examination of Reports of Member States noted that the requests for aid under the participation program indicated widespread interest in the development of social science teaching and research, with particular respect to applied problems of assimilation of immigrants, technological change, and international cooperation.

The net result of the discussion and votes on the social science program was an increase of \$129,000 over the amount recommended in the Director-General's budget, to make a total for the biennium of \$1,581,937.

The program of the Department of Social Sciences is divided into general activities and special activities.¹ General activities include subventions to international social science associations, clearinghouse activities including the publication of the *International Social Science Bulletin*, international bibliographies in the several fields of social science, preparation of social science dictionaries, and collection of statistics relating to education, culture, and mass communication. These activities were approved for continuation at about the present level of support.

The question of UNESCO sponsorship of institutes for social science received extended discussion. Two institutes have been established by UNESCO initiative in the past, and two more were approved by this Conference. Each of them has a different relation to UNESCO, and each presents different problems and potentialities.

The UNESCO Institute for Social Sciences at Cologne was established several years ago with the joint sponsorship of the U. S. High Commissioner for Germany. At present the Institute is almost completely dependent on UNESCO support, having failed to find other sources of funds. Considerable doubt concerning continued UNESCO financing of the Institute was expressed. It was finally decided to approve increased support for the next

two years during which a thorough re-examination would be undertaken.

The Research Center on Social Implications of Industrialization in Southern Asia was established in Calcutta in 1956, and a formal opening ceremony was held following the conclusion of the New Delhi Conference. The Center's staff is an integral part of the UNESCO secretariat, but with necessary autonomy for effective action, and funds are provided for research costs and for five training fellowships.

The Conference voted support for the establishment of two new centers in Latin America, but in these instances the responsibility for the major share of the funds rests with the government of the host country, and UNESCO's contribution will terminate after four years. A center in Santiago, Chile, will undertake to train social science teachers and research workers from any country of Latin America. UNESCO will supply four visiting professors for the center which will be a part of the University of Chile. The other center will be established in Brazil as a regional research center for social problems in Latin America, and will emphasize studies of social implications of technological change. Specific plans for the organization and staffing were not complete at the time of the Conference.

The Conference, by the serious tone of its extended discussion, stressed the significance that it attached to teaching and the training of workers in the social sciences, and voted increased funds for aid to member states in the development of this field. The general survey of the teaching of social sciences, published in a series of nine booklets, and the specific resolutions adopted at regional conferences in South Asia, the Middle East, and Central America provide a sound foundation for governments desiring to improve social science teaching at the university level in their own countries.

Problems of international understanding have always been of high concern to UNESCO, and the difficult task has been to determine how the social sciences can make their most effective contribution. The resolution of the Montevideo Conference calling for studies "of the means of promoting peaceful cooperation" was reaffirmed at New Delhi, although the funds budgeted were not great (about \$40,000). UNESCO plans to carry out much of the work in this area through the international social science associations. It will take into account recommendations formulated by a conference of social science representatives from both East European and Western countries, held in Geneva last July. Two general problems were selected for attention: the historical evolution of the concept of peaceful cooperation, and economic relations between countries with different economic and

¹ A full and official account of the UNESCO program for 1957-58 is now available in *Unesco Chronicle*, 1957, Vol. III, No. 1-2.

social structures. Some members of the Conference were apprehensive about possible departures from objective social science techniques in projects in this area, and clearly indicated a preference for established scientific methods and avoidance of political and propaganda issues which are outside the scope of UNESCO.

The great contribution of UNESCO to the understanding of human rights and minorities was recognized, and the continuation of a small program of publication and consultation was authorized.

Perhaps the most striking development emerging from the discussion of the social science program was the keen interest in the study and analysis of social conditions and consequences of rapid economic and industrial change. A considerable part of the effort of the Department of Social Sciences will be devoted to activities in this area, involving cooperation with the International Research Office on Social Implications of Technological Change (Paris), the Research Center on Social Implications of Industrialization in Southern Asia (Calcutta), and the newly established research center in Brazil. A joint seminar with the United Nations and the International Labor Office on the problems of urbanization in Latin America will be held in 1958, following a series of studies in three Latin American countries on the human and social implications of urbanization.

There has been little progress in systematic evaluation of UNESCO's several programs. A manual on methods of evaluation has been produced but, regrettably, no unit of UNESCO has requested outside evaluation of its projects. Accordingly, no increase was requested in the very modest funds for this activity of the Department of Social Sciences.

FUTURE COOPERATION OF THE COUNCIL

Preliminary steps are already under way in preparation for the Tenth General Conference, which will be held in the newly built UNESCO House in Paris in the fall of 1958. In March 1957 a fifth meeting of the informal conference group brought together by the Council reviewed the program for 1957-58 and developed suggestions for carrying it out. The first draft of the secretariat's proposals for the 1959-60 program has been examined by the Program Committee of the National Commission, and will be the subject of preliminary discussion by the Executive Board of UNESCO meeting in Paris in June, and by the U. S. National Commission meeting in San Francisco in November. The repetitive and frequent requirements for consideration of program proposals place a real demand on the Council if it is to respond to present needs. Efforts to strengthen international cooperation and communication among social scientists have been of increasing concern to the Council since the close of World War II. Whether the Council should establish a formal committee on UNESCO and International Social Science Council affairs or, more generally, another committee on international cooperation in social science are questions repeatedly examined by the Council. The flexibility of the present informal method of dealing with requests for counsel and assistance in this general area has seemed to have merit. Whether the Council could contribute more effectively to this country's participation in the UNESCO program through a committee to plan research on social change or through a committee of broader scope is certain to receive further consideration.

SURVEY METHODS IN RESEARCH ON HEALTH PROBLEMS: A REPORT ON THE SUMMER RESEARCH TRAINING INSTITUTE, 1956

by Clyde W. Hart *

THE purpose of the research training institute conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, from July 9 to August 17, 1956, was to review systematically major substantive and methodological problems involved in studying the social aspects of health and health care. Since such study, as a rule, involves the collection and analysis of information from the public or segments of the public, emphasis was placed on the survey approach, with attention to such

* The author is Director of the National Opinion Research Center and served also as director of the institute, which was sponsored by the Council's Committee on Research Training, as announced in *Items*, March 1956, pp. 9-10. The participants are listed in the Council's *Annual Report 1955-56*, p. 87.

basic considerations as the development of workable research designs, sampling theory and practice, methods of collecting data, methods of quantifying qualitative data, construction of scales and indices, other analytical procedures, and the presentation and use of research findings.

Despite this emphasis on the survey method, the program of the institute was largely problem oriented rather than abstractly didactic. That is, lectures and discussions in the formal sessions were organized primarily in relation to five major problem areas in the health field: assessments of morbidity, utilization of medical services and expenditures therefor, subjective factors in health,

evaluation of health programs, and institutional approaches to health. Approximately a week of formal sessions was devoted to each of these areas.

Each participant was asked to bring with him working materials from his own research undertakings, so that attention could be given in critical sessions, as well as in personal conferences between individual participants and individual staff members, to methodological questions of immediate relevance to the participants' own interests and levels of previous preparation. Each member of the Center's staff was available by appointment for consultation on any problems, substantive or methodological, that were of particular concern to any participant. Also in accordance with this problem orientation, the protocols and collections of data developed in the course of the Center's own studies in the health field were available for study by the participants, and for discussion in the formal sessions of the institute and in personal conferences with the appropriate study directors. These materials included statements of the problems involved in the Center's researches, pretest and final questionnaires, instructions for field interviewers, sampling plans and sampling instructions, code books and coding instructions, and analytical plans, as well as tabulations and reports for studies that were completed or nearly completed. The library of the Center assembled special archives of research materials as well as bibliographies of research publications bearing on all relevant problem areas and on the various aspects of survey method.

When the plans for the institute were announced late in 1955, many requests for further information and for application forms were received both from academic social scientists concerned with research on health and from research workers in health agencies. Applicants were expected to have achieved postdoctoral or equivalent standing, to be firmly committed to research in the health field, and to be available for the full six-week period. Twenty-five qualified persons filed formal applications for enrollment, and from this group the thirteen seemingly best qualified were selected.

Each morning, Monday through Friday, throughout the six weeks, was given over to a workshop session. These sessions were of two kinds: (1) discussions of specific areas of survey research on health and consideration of the methodological and technical problems arising in connection with them, and (2) group critiques of research projects of the participants themselves. In preparation for the latter type of session, each participant reviewed in advance his proposed report on his project with a staff member, and in some cases made available to all participants summaries, questionnaires, sampling plans, and other materials for prior review. An effort

was made to schedule such presentations by participants so as to maximize the relation to the area of research under discussion at other sessions during a given week. Afternoons were generally left free for individual study, informal discussions with other participants, personal consultation with staff members, visits to other centers in the city where important research undertakings were in process, and for occasional special sessions arranged as the need for them developed. Unfortunately, only two such sessions were held, although there were many informal sessions involving two to five participants, without faculty participation.

One of these special sessions was given over to a discussion of "A Proposal for Large-Scale Community Research in the Epidemiology of Essential Hypertension in Man," by Robert Merton et al.,¹ which participants had studied carefully beforehand; the other was a session on scaling, to deal more extensively with scaling problems that had arisen during the morning sessions. These two special sessions were among the features of the institute highly commended by the participants in their final critiques.

The institute faculty was drawn largely from the senior research staff of the National Opinion Research Center: Clyde W. Hart (Director), Jack Elinson (Coordinator), Shirley A. Star, Jacob J. Feldman, Donald J. Bogue, and Paul B. Sheatsley. Other faculty members were Herbert H. Hyman, special consultant with the Center and Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, and Odin W. Anderson, Director of Research, Health Information Foundation. Several members of the faculty of the University of Chicago and of the Michael Reese Medical Research Institute, though not serving as regular members of the institute staff, contributed substantially to some of its sessions.

The Biological and Social Science Divisions of the University sponsored a special series of public lectures on "Medicine and Social Research," which provided backgrounds in the several problem areas that were discussed in formal sessions of the institute. In cooperation with representatives of the Center, the Deans of these two Divisions selected and brought to the campus six distinguished students of health problems. Attendance was required of all institute participants, and all the lecturers except one participated in the institute session held the following morning.

At the very end of the institute two days were given over to summation and appraisal and to consideration of ways in which the experience might have been more

¹ In *A Symposium on Essential Hypertension* (Boston: Commonwealth of Massachusetts Recess Commission on Hypertension, and Columbia University School of Public Health and Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1951), pp. 327-334.

productive. Each participant wrote a separate critique in preparation for these discussions. From these and from corresponding attempts at evaluation by staff members, there emerged some suggestions that might be helpful to others entering upon similar ventures.

First, the organization of formal sessions about problem areas in social science research on health and health care seems, on the whole, to have worked out satisfactorily, and to have been particularly useful to the participants in resolving practical technical problems in research. While there seemed to be general agreement on this point, two or three participants would have preferred more use of what we have called the "didactic" approach—that is, more abstract discussion of phases of method. One of these, who held that the "basic idea of discussing methodological problems in the context of concrete research, both that undertaken by participants of the institute and staff of the NORC, was an excellent one," nevertheless recognized that the "levels of skill for any given technique undoubtedly varied among us, but this could have been handled by subdividing the group in terms of level of performance . . . Such didactic sessions, perhaps incorporating a laboratory learning situation, could well have supplemented the morning sessions." This suggestion has merit and would certainly be acted upon were we repeating the institute.

The difference in the prior levels of preparation of the participants suggests other modifications that might have been made in handling the critical sessions of the institute, where a participant's own research was scheduled for discussion. More detailed instructions should have been given participants in advance of their coming to Chicago, as to the kinds of materials on their own research that they would need—a clear statement of the problem, a detailed research plan to be followed in attacking this problem, including statements of the kinds of data to be collected and the procedures to be employed in collecting them, the analytical plans to be followed, etc., together with a formulation of any questions that he would like to have considered. With this kind of preparation, more attention could have been given in the critical sessions to conceptualization, assessment of relevant theory, and the appropriateness of the investigator's analytical and interpretive efforts.

There is a second way in which the institute could have been better adapted to the different levels of preparation of participants. Not only did they differ rather widely, despite the care employed in selecting them, in their background preparation and actual research experience; the problems on which they were currently engaged differed, also, in scope, complexity, and stage of development. On the other hand, several of them fell in the same substantive area and involved the use of sub-

stantially the same methods and techniques. More account should have been taken of these facts in planning the critical sessions in order to secure a more economic use of time and a more satisfactory range of materials.

Another suggestion on which participants and staff were agreed was that more afternoon sessions like those on scaling and the Merton document should have been arranged. There was agreement, also, on the suggestion that more explicit assignments should have been made to prepare participants for both the scheduled morning sessions and the special afternoon sessions. It was thought that such advance preparation would have enhanced the productiveness, from the participants' point of view, of nearly all the sessions. Moreover, it would have given them guidance in exploring the bibliographies in the several substantive fields.

Mention should be made, too, of another suggestion voiced by three or four of the participants, perhaps the more academically oriented. It can best be stated in one participant's own words: "Here I am probably expressing my own bias in interest, but I felt that the content of the institute was a little too heavily weighted in terms of sampling, interviewing techniques, and item coding. To me, the crucial problems of research lie at later stages of the project. While certain famous exceptions exist, the major fault of most research, as I see it, is that even if sampling and interviewing are impeccable, the study doesn't say anything, or what it says has no relation to the data. I would have liked to see a greater focus on the logic of interpretation of findings, hypothesis testing, conceptual models, simple mathematical models, scaling, latent distance, etc. The major focus of the sessions seemed to be on 'point estimation,' while the major need in research, again as I see it, is for codification of methods of making the leap from tables to statements of and inferences about relationships and systems of relationships. I would have liked to spend more time on the questions: (1) Do the data justify the concepts used in the interpretation? (What do attitude scales measure? Do demographic correlations really justify interpretation in terms of social interaction processes? What is the logic of causal arguments?) (2) Do the interpretations form a logically coherent system, and if so is it the most efficient system to fit these data?"

Several participants expressed the wish that more attention could have been given to the coding phase of the conduct of a survey. To secure better balance in an over-all program, more attention should have been given to content analysis, to special problems involved in the quantification of qualitative data, both in lectures and discussions and also, perhaps, through some laboratory assignments.

In spite of the preceding suggestions concerning modi-

fications in the basic plan of the institute, we believe its essential features proved to be effective: the discussion of method and technique largely within the context of actual research undertakings; the emphasis on substantive problems as a prior consideration in all research; the resort to a more abstract, didactic approach only as

the need for it appears in course; the employment generally of a freely conversational but rigorously critical method of discussion; and encouraging wide knowledge, both substantive and methodological, of the research enterprise as it shapes up in a particular field, and personal acquaintance with the people who man this enterprise.

PERSONNEL

FACULTY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Faculty Research Fellowships—Lyle H. Lanier (chairman), William H. Nicholls, Emmette S. Redford, John W. Riley, Jr., John Useem, and C. Vann Woodward—at its meeting on March 21 recommended 6 new appointments for three-year terms beginning in 1957:

David Gold, Associate Professor of Sociology, State University of Iowa, for the development of certain techniques of statistical analysis adapted especially to sociological research.

Andrew F. Henry, Associate Professor of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, for research on social and psychosomatic factors related to modes of expression of anger, and completion of a study of deviation from social norms.

Harvey Leibenstein, Associate Professor of Economics, University of California, Berkeley, for research on relations between cultural patterns and the development of underdeveloped economies.

Sidney W. Mintz, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Yale University, for research on the internal marketing system of Haiti in relation to the society as a whole.

Bradford Perkins, Assistant Professor of History, University of California, Los Angeles, for research on certain aspects of Anglo-American relations, 1805-25.

Marc Raeff, Assistant Professor of Russian History and Language, Clark University, for research on the professional intelligentsia in Russia and in Western Europe.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Social Science Personnel—Earl Latham (chairman), Robert E. L. Faris, Ward H. Goodenough, Richard B. Heflebower, Wayne H. Holtzman, and Paul Webbink—at its meeting on March 18-19 voted to award 43 research training fellowships for 1957-58, 8 postdoctoral and 35 predoctoral. Of these, 27—6 postdoctoral and 21 predoctoral—have been accepted. The complete list of candidates selected, including those who have declined their awards in order to accept support from other sources, follows:

Fred Adelman, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, for research in the United States on Kalmyk Mongol social and religious acculturation.

Douglas E. Ashford, Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for research in France and Morocco on the Moroccan nationalist movement.

Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in history, Cornell University, for training and research on the history of the Seneca Indians.

William G. Bowen,* Ph.D. candidate in economics, Princeton University, for research on wage increases and prices in certain industries since the Korean War. Ernest Q. Campbell, Ph.D. in sociology, Vanderbilt University, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Florida State University, for further methodological training in social psychology at Harvard University.

John T. Cole, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, for ethnographic research in Bolivia on the Uru Indians.

Peggy L. P. Cook, Ph.D. candidate in social psychology, Columbia University, for research on effects of interaction of experimenter and subject on test performance.

Milton C. Cummings, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in government, Harvard University, for research on United States congressional elections.

Carr L. Donald,* Ph.D. candidate in government, University of Texas, for research in Brazil on local government in rural municipios.

William W. Dusinberre,* Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for research on the Southern question in Philadelphia politics, 1856-70.

Melvin L. Ember, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Yale University, postdoctoral fellowship for further statistical training and for research in the United States on cross-cultural variations in political institutions.

Jean Ann Engler,* Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Northwestern University, postdoctoral fellowship for training in mathematical statistics.

Jack D. Forbes, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Southern California, for research in Spain on Apache-Spanish relations on the frontier of New Spain.

Stanley A. Freed, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, postdoctoral fellowship for research in India on urbanization in the New Delhi area.

Morris Freilich, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for comparative study in Trinidad of East Indian and Negro communities.

Franklee Gilbert, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of North Carolina, for research on national income of the United States, 1790-1840.

Juliet M. Gray,* Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Stanford University, postdoctoral fellowship for further training in the application of mathematical models in psychology.

Eugene A. Hammel, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, for research in Peru on the Ica valley economy and social structure.

Mitchell Harwitz,* Ph.D. candidate in economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for research on the theory of comparative advantage.

* Declined award.

- Douglas H. Heath, Ph.D. in psychology, Harvard University, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Haverford College, for training at the University of Michigan in statistics and experimental methods.
- Terence K. Hopkins, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Columbia University, for research on methods of structural analysis of formally organized groups.
- Dale W. Jorgenson,* Ph.D. candidate in economics, Harvard University, for research on the theory of investment.
- Morton Klass, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for research in Trinidad on an East Indian community.
- Igor Kopytoff,* Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Northwestern University, for ethnographic study in Angola and the Belgian Congo of the Basuku.
- Stanley G. Long, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Northwestern University, for training in demand analysis at the Universities of Cambridge and Uppsala and for empirical research in Austria.
- Michael C. Lovell, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Harvard University, for research on manufacturers' inventories as a factor in economic fluctuations.
- Richard D. Mann, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, for research on personality and social interaction.
- Robert McGinnis, Ph.D. in sociology, Northwestern University, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, for training in mathematics and mathematical statistics at the University of California, Berkeley.
- Stanley Milgram, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Harvard University, for replication in the United States and in Norway of an experiment on response to social group pressure.
- Frank C. Miller,* Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Harvard University, for comparative study in Mexico of medical beliefs and practices in various communities.
- Thomas Naff,* Ph.D. candidate in history, University of California, Berkeley, for training at the London School of Oriental Studies and for research on Ottoman-British relations in the sixteenth century.
- Thomas Natsoulas,* Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, for research on some problems of cognition.
- Hubert J. O'Gorman, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Columbia University, for research on relations between lawyers and clients.
- Peter Park, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Yale University, postdoctoral fellowship for training at Harvard University in mathematics and high-speed computing machine techniques.
- Hugh T. Patrick,* Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Michigan, for research in Japan on credit policies of the Bank of Japan since 1949.
- Samuel C. Patterson,* Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Wisconsin, for research training in social psychology and for research on state legislative politics.
- Dean Peabody, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Harvard University, for training at the Institut des Sciences de l'Education, Geneva, Switzerland, and for research on attitude measurement.
- H. Laurence Ross, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Harvard University, for training at the University of Chicago in urban ecology.

* Declined award.

- Richard L. Sklar,* Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for research in Nigeria on political parties.
- George J. Staller, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Cornell University, for research in the United States on postwar industrial development in Czechoslovakia.
- Herrmann O. Stekler,* Ph.D. candidate in economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for training and research on problems of economic forecasting.
- Robert D. Stevens,* Ph.D. candidate in economics, Cornell University, for research in the Lebanon on capital formation in agricultural villages.
- Henry A. Turner, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in history, Princeton University, for research in Europe on the German People's Party, 1918-30.

* Declined award.

POLITICAL THEORY AND LEGAL PHILOSOPHY FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Political Theory and Legal Philosophy Fellowships—J. Roland Pennock (chairman), Herbert A. Deane, David Easton, Norman Jacobson, Robert G. McCloskey, and F. M. Watkins—at its meeting on March 13 awarded 9 fellowships:

- John W. Chapman, Assistant Professor of Government, Smith College, for research in England on modern political idealism with special reference to the thought of the Oxford Idealists.
- Sanford A. Lakoff, Ph.D. candidate in government, Harvard University, for research on the idea of equality in modern Western thought.
- Harold A. McNitt, Instructor in Philosophy, Western Reserve University, for research in Sweden on the new school of sociology and social theory at the University of Uppsala.
- David C. Rapoport, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of California, Berkeley, for research on government without consensus, with particular reference to military-dominated governments.
- Peter Riesenberg, Assistant Professor of History, Swarthmore College, for research in Europe on the political theory of the late medieval legists as developed in the consilia literature.
- John R. Rodman, Ph.D. candidate in government, Harvard University, for research on Hegel and the nineteenth century revolution in political philosophy.
- Rudolph H. Weingartner, Ph.D. candidate in philosophy, Columbia University, for study of Georg Simmel's social philosophy.
- Robert P. Wolff, Teaching Fellow in Philosophy, Harvard University, for study of the political economy and governmental institutions of the United States and of the obligations and rights of citizens in a democratic state.
- Marvin Zetterbaum, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Chicago, for research on political judgment and applications of social science in government.

FIRST-YEAR GRADUATE STUDY FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Undergraduate Research Training—R. F. Arragon (chairman), Dwight W. Chapman, Wilbert J. McKeachie, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., John M. Roberts, and

Everett K. Wilson—at its meeting on March 15 voted to award 25 first-year graduate study fellowships for 1957–58. All the appointees had received undergraduate research stipends in 1956.

The undergraduate research training program, initiated in the spring of 1953 with support provided by the Ford Foundation, terminates with this year's appointments. The appointees, their undergraduate colleges, and fields of graduate study are listed below:

- Tatsuo Arima, Harvard University; political science.
A. John Arrowood,* University of Minnesota; psychology.
Nancy L. Bonte, Oberlin College; sociology.
Inge Komers Broverman, Clark University; psychology.
Eleanor L. Commo, Wellesley College; history.
Richard Cramer, University of Michigan; sociology.
Roy G. D'Andrade, University of Connecticut; anthropology.
Frederick R. Dyer, Syracuse University; psychology.
Gordon A. Fellman, Antioch College; sociology.
Alan Harwood, Harvard University; anthropology and history.
Esther Helfman, University of Michigan; psychology.
Stanislav V. Kasl, Yale University; psychology.
Thomas E. Lux, St. John Fisher College; anthropology.
Wilda M. Marraffino, Trinity College, Washington, D. C.; history.
Bruce P. Muller, Manhattan College; psychology.
Patricia A. Niles,* Swarthmore College; psychology.
Philip Odeen, University of South Dakota; public administration.
Marvin E. Olsen, Grinnell College; sociology.
George S. Reynolds, Harvard University; social relations.
Martha A. Sandoz, Reed College; social psychology.
David Schechter, Brooklyn College; political science.
Vello Sermat, University of Toronto; psychology.
Jeremy J. Stone, Swarthmore College; mathematical economics.
Michael D. Tanzer, Harvard University; economics.
Judith Ulbricht, Washington University; sociology.

* Declined award.

GRANTS-IN-AID

The Committee on Grants-in-Aid—R. A. Gordon (chairman), E. Malcolm Carroll, Gwendolen M. Carter, John Hope Franklin, Calvin S. Hall, and Stuart A. Queen—at its meeting on March 26–27 voted to award 29 grants-in-aid under the continuing program established in 1927, and 18 faculty research grants under the new program announced in September 1956; 9 scholars were named as alternates under the first program and 2 of these have subsequently been granted awards. The complete lists follow:

Grants-in-Aid of Research

Thomas B. Alexander, Professor of History, Georgia Teachers College, for research in the northeastern United States on the American Whigs, 1860–1900.

Dorothy C. Bacon, Professor of Economics, Smith College, for research in the Philippines on banking institutions and economic development.

Marver H. Bernstein, Associate Professor of Politics, Princeton University, for research in Israel on its local government.

Edgar F. Borgatta, Professor of Sociology, New York University, for research on personality and behavior in small groups.

William A. Bultmann, Associate Professor of History, Arkansas State Teachers College, for research in England on relations between the Church of England and continental Protestant churches, 1689–1720.

John C. Cairns, Assistant Professor of History, University of Toronto, for research in France and the United States on the fall of France, 1940.

Rondo E. Cameron, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin, for research in the United States on the role of France in the economic development of Europe.

Howard F. Cline, Director, Hispanic Foundation, Library of Congress, for research in the United States on the prehistory of Chinantla, Mexico.

John B. Cornell, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Texas, for research in the United States on the socioeconomic status of the Eta in Japanese society.

Harry H. Eckstein, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University, for research in England on political activities of the British Medical Association.

Sidney Goldstein, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Brown University, for research on labor turnover in a factory, 1935–55.

Wytze Gorter, Associate Professor of Economics, University of California, Los Angeles, for research in the Netherlands on the economic consequences of the loss of Indonesia.

Wesley L. Gould, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Purdue University, for comparative research in the Netherlands on Dutch and American decisions on issues in international law.

George L. Haskins, Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania, for research on Massachusetts law in the seventeenth century (alternate).

Charles Jelavich,* Assistant Professor of History, University of California, Berkeley, for research in Yugoslavia on the ideal and reality of nationalism.

William F. Kahl, Assistant Professor of History, Simmons College, for research in England on the London livery companies, 1688–1750.

Samson B. Knoll, Instructor in Sociology and Languages, Menlo College, for research in Germany on investigations of subversive activities, 1819–48 (alternate).

Ruth Landes, Ph.D. in anthropology, Pomona, California, for completion of research on the Kansas Potawatomi.

Robert B. Lane, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Hawaii, for research in Australia, New Zealand, and the New Hebrides on social structure in the New Hebrides.

Gardner Lindzey, Professor of Psychology, Syracuse University, for research on certain personality variables in interpersonal relations (renewal).

Joseph J. Mathews, Professor of History, Emory University, for research on the career of George W. Smalley.

* Declined award.

- Donald R. Matthews, Assistant Professor of Government, Smith College, for research on the roles of U. S. Senators in the 80th-84th Congresses.
- Henry Cord Meyer, Associate Professor of History, Pomona College, for research in the United States on the German *Drang Nach Osten*, 1860-1914.
- Thomas F. Pettigrew, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of North Carolina, for research on a new perceptual dimension of personality.
- Edward H. Phillips, Assistant Professor of History, Rice Institute, for research on Timothy Pickering and the Federalist Party.
- Robert C. Pratt, Assistant Professor of Political Science, McGill University, for research in England on British Colonial policy in Busoga District, Uganda.
- Ramon E. Ruiz, Assistant Professor of History, University of Oregon, for research in Mexico on rural education in Mexico, 1910-56 (alternate).
- Robert A. Rupen, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Bryn Mawr College, for research in the United States on Mongolian nationalism in the twentieth century.
- Richard Schlatter, Professor of History, Rutgers University, for research in England on political thought, 1658-60 (alternate).
- Stephen M. Schwebel, LL.D., New York City, for research in England on the law of international concessions (alternate).
- Marion C. Siney, Associate Professor of History, Western Reserve University, for research in England and Sweden on Swedish foreign policy, 1939-45.
- George W. Smith, Associate Professor of History, University of New Mexico, for research on the Northern States during the Civil War.
- David S. Sparks, Assistant Professor of History, University of Maryland, for research on General Henry W. Halleck and military command in a democracy.
- Evon Z. Vogt, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University, for research in Mexico on comparative culture change in Tzotzil and Tzeltal Indian communities in Chiapas (alternate).
- Huang Wen-Shan, M.A., Los Angeles, California, for research on Totemism in Chinese culture (alternate).
- Dorothy Ann Williams, Associate Professor of History, Principia College, for research in England on London in relation to the Puritan revolution and the Civil Wars, 1610-40.
- mobility of laborers with specific reference to places of residence and of work.
- Lucien M. Hanks, Faculty of Social Science, Bennington College, for research in Thailand on social change in a rice-growing community.
- George A. Lensen, Associate Professor of History, Florida State University, for research on Russo-Japanese relations, 1697-1875.
- Trevor Lloyd, Professor of Geography, Dartmouth College, for research in Scandinavia on the economic development of arctic Finland.
- Albert J. Mayer, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Wayne State University, for research on population changes in a middle-class neighborhood.
- David P. McAllester,* Associate Professor of Anthropology, Wesleyan University, for research on Navaho and Apache medicine men.
- James B. Parsons, Assistant Professor of Far Eastern History and Culture, University of California, Riverside, for research in Japan on the composition of the governing bureaucracy of China in the Ming Dynasty.
- Henry A. Peck, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Maine, for research in Jamaica on economic development and the balance of payments.
- Calvin F. Schmid, Professor of Sociology, University of Washington, for research on the ecology of crime in Seattle.
- Elman R. Service, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Michigan, for research in Mexico on the northern Tepehuan Indians of Chihuahua.
- Thomas C. Smith, Associate Professor of History, Stanford University, for research in Japan on its agrarian background.
- Edward H. Spicer, Professor of Anthropology, University of Arizona, for a comparative study of directed culture change among southwestern Indians, 1540-1950.
- Bernard D. Weinryb, Professor of History, Dropsie College, for research in Europe and Israel on the economic and social history of Jews in Eastern Europe.
- Bertie Wilkinson, Professor of History, University of Toronto, for research in England on fifteenth century English history.
- * Declined award.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON HISTORY OF AMERICAN MILITARY POLICY

The Committee on National Security Policy Research—William T. R. Fox (chairman), Herbert Goldhamer, Henry A. Kissinger, Richard W. Leopold, G. A. Lincoln, John W. Masland, Arthur Smithies, and Harold Stein—at its meeting on March 16 awarded 6 grants for research on the history of American military policy:

- Richard H. Fraser, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Oklahoma, for research on the foundations of American military policy, 1783-1815.
- Fred Greene, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Williams College, for research on the military policy of the United States, 1921-32 (renewal).
- Harold M. Hyman, Associate Professor of History, Arizona State College, for research on the policies and functions of the Army Provost Marshal and resulting problems in civil-military relations, 1774-1920.
- Joel Colton,* Assistant Professor of History, Duke University, for research in the United States and France on Leon Blum and French socialism since 1919.
- Richard S. Crutchfield, Professor of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, for research in England on psychological factors in conformity.
- Robert E. Dickinson, Professor of Geography, Syracuse University, for research in Western Europe on spatial
- * Declined award.

Thomas LeDuc, Professor of History, Oberlin College, for research on the use of federal armed forces in support of civil power, 1789-1939.

Louis Morton, Deputy Chief Historian, Department of the Army, for research on naval war plans, 1919-38 (renewal).

Raymond G. O'Connor, Instructor in History, Stanford University, for research on the role of the Navy General Board in American naval policy, 1900-1922.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON STATE POLITICS

The Committee on Political Behavior—David B. Truman (chairman), Angus Campbell, Robert A. Dahl, Oliver Garceau, Alexander Heard, V. O. Key, Jr., Avery Leiserson, and Dayton D. McKean—at its meeting on March 9 awarded 6 grants for research on state politics:

Henry M. Bain, Jr., Consultant (government studies), National Science Foundation, for research on party organization and activities and careers of political leaders in selected Maryland counties and city districts (renewal).

Gordon E. Baker, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California, Santa Barbara, for research on political power in rural and urban areas and the process of initiative and referendum in California, Oregon, and Washington.

Jack E. Holmes, Director, New Mexico Legislative Council Service, for research on relationships between political and governmental structures and procedures in New Mexico.

Lester F. Schmidt, Assistant Professor of Social Science, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana, for research on a "United Front" movement among Wisconsin liberals, 1934-41.

Lester G. Seligman, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Oregon, for research on the recruitment of leaders of state party organizations (renewal).

Kenneth N. Vines, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Tulane University, for research on recruitment of political personnel in Louisiana.

GRANTS FOR SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

The Subcommittee on Grants—Abram Bergson (chairman), William B. Ballis, Edward J. Brown, Oscar Halecki, and Chauncy D. Harris—of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies, which is co-sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, met on March 17. The subcommittee awarded 19 grants-in-aid of research and named 3 alternates:

Edgar Anderson, Instructor in History, Lake Forest College, for research on the Baltic states in world politics, 1914-54 (alternate).

Zbigniew Brzezinski, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University, for research in Poland on relations between the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries.

Peter K. Christoff, Associate Professor of History, San Francisco State College, for research on nineteenth century Russian Slavophilism.

Alexander Erlich, Visiting Lecturer in Economics, Columbia University, for research on the Soviet industrialization controversy, 1924-28.

André von Gronicka,* Associate Professor of German, Columbia University, for research in Western Europe on Goethe's influence in Russia.

Gregory Grossman, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of California, Berkeley, for research on the nature and role of prices in the Soviet economy.

Sidney S. Harcave, Associate Professor of History, Harpur College, State University of New York, for research on the life and role of Nicholas II.

W. A. Douglas Jackson, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of Washington, for research on the problems of agricultural geographical development in the Soviet Union.

Svatava Pírková Jakobson, Lecturer on Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard University, for research in Yugoslavia on calendar and family rituals in a Yugoslav village.

Ante Kadić, Lecturer in Serbo-Croatian, University of California, Berkeley, for research in Yugoslavia on contemporary Yugoslav literature.

Ivo John Lederer, Instructor in History, Princeton University, for research on American policy and the Yugoslav territorial settlement, 1919-20.

George S. N. Luckyj, Associate Professor of Slavic Studies, University of Toronto, for research in Western Europe on the impact of Stalinist cultural policy on non-Russian nationalities, 1932-53.

Allen McConnell, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Brown University, for research on Western political thought and its influence in Russia, 1762-1825.

Roderick E. McGrew, Assistant Professor of History, University of Missouri, for research on Karamzin's theory of historical causation and its role in the development of Russian conservatism (alternate).

Nicholas N. Poppe, Professor, Department of Far Eastern and Slavic Languages and Literature, University of Washington, for research in Germany on the cultural status of Moslems in Central Asia.

Raymond P. Powell,* Assistant Professor of Economics, Yale University, for research on Soviet monetary policy. Edward Stankiewicz, Assistant Professor of Slavic Studies, Indiana University, for research in Yugoslavia on the phonemic systems of some Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian dialects.

Leon Stilman, Associate Professor of Russian Language and Literature, Columbia University, for a study of the life and work of Nikolai Gogol.

Marc Szeftel, Professor of Russian History, Cornell University, for research on the political institutions of the Russian constitutional monarchy, 1905-17.

Jozo Tomasevich, Professor of Economics, San Francisco State College, for research on political and economic policies and developments in Yugoslavia, 1945-56 (renewal).

Piotr S. Wandycz, Instructor in History, Indiana University, for research in Western Europe on French-Czechoslovak-Polish relations, 1919-39.

Stanley J. Zyzniewski, Acting Assistant Professor of History, University of Virginia, for research in Finland on Russian attitudes toward the Congress Kingdom of Poland, 1815-30 (alternate).

* Declined award.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

Grants to individuals for social science research on the Near and Middle East will be offered by the Social Science Research Council for three years beginning in 1958. This new program will be administered by the Council's Committee on the Near and Middle East, and supported from funds provided by the Ford Foundation. Applicants must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States or Canada.

Emphasis will be placed on research relating to the modern period in the Near and Middle East. Grants are expected to range from relatively small sums for travel or research assistance during a single summer to amounts sufficient for a year's travel and research, including maintenance in lieu of salary. The annual number of awards will vary, therefore, depending on the nature and scope of the applications received; the available funds should permit from 5 to 15 grants a year.

Applications will be welcomed not only from scholars with established competence in Near and Middle Eastern studies but also from individuals with established competence in a social science field who wish to advance their training and research relating to problems of the Near and Middle East. Grants will be offered only to mature scholars who are not candidates for academic degrees, and whose capacity for effective research has been demonstrated by their previous work. It is contemplated that preference will be given to applicants not associated with institutions that have special funds for research on the Near and Middle Eastern field, although consideration may be given to needs of staff members of such institutions for supplementary assistance.

Applications for support of research to be initiated in the summer or autumn of 1958 must be submitted to the Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. not later than November 1, 1957. It is planned to announce the awards for this first year of the program by January 1, 1958. Inquiries and requests for application forms should indicate briefly the nature of the proposed research and the approximate amount of financial support required, but need not include the detailed budgetary and other information that will be requested on the forms themselves.

SENIOR RESEARCH PROGRAM IN GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

A five-year program of senior research awards in American governmental affairs will be initiated by the Social Science Research Council in 1957, with funds granted to the Council by the Ford Foundation. Under this program, it is expected that about 5 awards will be made each year to individuals who have demonstrated high competence in research and who, through their published works, have made significant contributions to the understanding of American governmental affairs. The scope of the program has been defined broadly: proposals for research on governmental affairs at the national, the state, or the local level will be given equally careful consideration. In view of the related program sponsored by the Ford Foundation and providing research professorships at six universities—the University of California, Berkeley, University of Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale Universities—awards to members of their faculties do not come within the program to be administered by the Council.

Awards under this program will provide for salary replacement, travel, and other expenses relating to research. The maximum award to any one individual for twelve months will be \$20,000; if a longer period of research is desired, funds within this limit may be utilized over the extended period. No individual will be eligible for more than two awards under the program.

Persons interested in applying for support of research on governmental affairs are invited to write to the Council, presenting their plans for such research during a specific period. The Council will also be glad to receive the names of highly qualified persons as nominees to be brought informally to the attention of the committee in charge of the program. Following review of the inquiries and suggestions obtained from all sources, the committee will invite selected persons to communicate further with it about their research plans. Recipients of awards will be chosen from among this latter group.

Letters of inquiry and suggestions of qualified candidates should be submitted to the Council by November 1, 1957. Awards will be announced in January 1958, and appointments may begin as early as February 1958, but not later than October 1 of that year.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL 230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1957: GABRIEL A. ALMOND, TAYLOR COLE, HAROLD F. DORN, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, R. A. GORDON, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, LYLE H. LANIER, EARL LATHAM, DONALD G. MARQUIS, JOHN PERRY MILLER, PHILIP E. MOSELY, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, FRANK C. NEWMAN, WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS, DAVID M. POTTER, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, RICHARD H. SHRYOCK, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, CONRAD TAEUBER, ROBERT L. THORNDIKE, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, RALPH J. WATKINS, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, President; PAUL WEBBINK, Vice-President; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, Executive Associate; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, Financial Secretary